



-1-

AMENDMENT DOCUMENT

Remarks pertaining to Objection re Information Disclosure Statement.

As Applicants' Attorney, I wish to make most respectfully the following statements in regard to the Examiner's Objection to the apparent incompleteness of the Information Disclosure Statement.

First, I am aware that there was no necessity to file the Information Disclosure Statement since Applicants did not make a patent search, and, therefore, did not have any patent material to disclose.

I filed the Information Disclosure Statement to assert, most emphatically, that Applicants had long experience in the field of building construction and were most confident in their knowledge of various components related to this field. I repeated this experience in the Specification.

As Applicants stated on page 4 of the Specification: "We have been in the construction business long enough that we have not been aware of any type of fire protection system, so we did not feel that it was necessary to conduct any type of patent search."

In accordance with the procedure suggested in the MPEP, Applicants made a special effort to ensure that their invention would clearly describe the field of art in which it lay.

Applicants feel that their long experience and knowledge has been clearly expressed in the Application. Any delineation of machines, instruments, or tools acquired by this experience would be impossible, as suggested by MPEP 704.11. Even, if the Information Disclosure is not to be considered, the disclosure of that long experience is still in the Official Record.

AMENDMENT DOCUMENT

Remarks pertaining to Objection to Drawings

Applicants' Attorney greatly appreciates the Examiner's invitation to amend the Drawings by inclusion of the referral to the terms "passage member sealably passing thru said component of said structure", "overflow valve", and "switch member" in the Drawings, or those terms would be canceled from the Claims.

I respectfully believe that these terms are clearly indicative to any expert in the field of construction and completely meet the requirements of the law.

I quote from 69 CJS Patents 139 Sufficiency of Disclosure: "The applicant must describe or disclose the invention itself. The certainty of description which the statute requires is not greater than is reasonable, having regard for the subject matter; that which is common and well-known need not be described".

"The patent statute's enablement requirement requires that the specification adequately disclose to one skilled in the relevant art how to make, or in the case of a process, how to carry out, the claimed invention without undue experimentation".

Therefore, I believe it would be suitable and proper to consider these terms as completely descriptive to "an expert in the proper field", as stated in both the MPEP and CJS.

Thus, any expert in the construction field, as Applicants are, will clearly understand the terms "sealably positioned", "overflow valve", and "switch member".

Remarks pertaining to 35 USC 112 Rejection

I believe that the Remarks stated above as pertaining to the Drawings also pertain to the same terms, "sealably positioned", "overflow valve", and "switch member" under 35 USC 112 enablement. Therefore, I believe I can refer to those comments without repetition.

And, as to the Rejection of the Claims under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112, I believe this Rejection is completely overcome by the re-writing of the Claims, which corrects any misunderstanding of the Claims.